



"SOCIAL PROBLEMS"

and

**What the Whitney Government
is doing to solve them**

Speech by

HON. W. J. HANNA

In Reply to Mr. Rowell's Amendment (to the
Reply to the Speech from the Throne) to the
effect that Present Conditions Call for the
Creation of a Department to Deal with Social
Problems, including Labour Matters.

DELIVERED IN THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ON 19th FEBRUARY, 1914.

Printed by Order of
THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO.

n
f
h
v
t
n
th
y
p
to
of
th
th
co
He

este
We
on
" W
base
our
the
re

Speech by Hon W. J. Hanna in Reply to Mr. Rowell's Amendment (to the Reply to the Speech from the Throne) to the effect that Present Conditions Call for the Creation of a Department to Deal with Social Problems, including Labour Matters.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish at the outset to join very heartily indeed with those who have expressed their regret at the absence from this House of Sir James Whitney, our Leader. I am very happy to be in a position to say to this House and to this Province with some confidence that everything within the past few days points not only to his recovery from his present illness, but to his complete restoration to health and strength, so that he may be enabled to go on and serve his Province for years to come as he has so well and so ably served it in the past. I should like to join as well in the congratulations extended by the Leader of the Opposition to the hon. members of this House who have so well and so ably moved and seconded the Address this afternoon. They have done great credit to themselves personally, as well as to the good judgment of the constituencies that sent them here since we last met in this House.

MR. ROWELL'S BASELESS ALARMS.

Of course we on this side of the House were naturally interested to know what the amendment to the motion would be. We had a certain amount of curiosity on the subject, because on looking back over the past the question naturally arose: "What is there upon which the Leader of the Opposition can base an amendment?" We were at a loss to know, and lest our memories should be at fault we took occasion to look up the records of the past two Sessions, and in looking over these records one can only wonder in noting how anxious the Leader

of the Opposition has been, how curious he has felt, how alarmed he has become as to matters for which there was really no occasion for curiosity, and certainly none for alarm.

THE AMENDMENT OF 1912.

Two years ago there was an amendment, and we discussed it and thrashed it out pro and con. The Leader of the Opposition was in great alarm lest we should go wrong in some way with regard to a port on Hudson Bay. We were told that if lacking a port for Ontario on Hudson Bay, this Province of Ontario would go to the bow-wows at once, almost before the Session rose, and eloquently and earnestly and with all the ability he could bring to bear on the subject he told us how the Government of Manitoba had gone in and selected what territory it would and where it would and had excluded us entirely from Hudson Bay, and we were pleased to find when it was all over and the amendment settled and defeated, that there never was reason for curiosity at all, much less for alarm, because long before the amendment was moved or discussed Ontario had secured a port on Hudson Bay. And so ended the Resolution of 1912.

THE AMENDMENT OF LAST YEAR.

Now we come to the Session of 1913 and find him in great alarm again—not over the Hudson Bay—I did expect that there would be a motion congratulating us on getting the port on Hudson Bay—but the Leader of the Opposition overlooked it and preferred to have new grounds for alarm. The cause for alarm this time was that the bi-lingual situation in this Province was, in his judgment, in an awful condition. Something must happen, and must happen soon. He dare not venture what. The Government must just here and now propose something. As a fact, at that time there was nothing to say. The Government was administering the law, the Government has gone on and dealt with the matters involved as they came up.

MR. ROWELL'S SIGNIFICANT SILENCE.

We have had a number of bye-elections since, and, if my memory serves me aright, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has gone into those bye-elections and come out of them, has gone into the towns and villages and side roads and come back, and during all that time the occasion for curiosity and alarm as to bi-lingual schools has been entirely forgotten and neglected. These bye-elections came and went, and the silence of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition on this question was the main feature of those bye-elections.

A MISAPPLIED REFERENCE.

Coming to the speech of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I wish to refer to a statement made by him in the course of that speech. He referred to members of this side of the House and their "allies," and when pressed to explain his use of the word, stated that by the "allies" of the Government he meant the liquor trade of the Province. I shall deal with this question now, as it is not the first time I have heard that statement. It has, I understand, been made on public platforms of this Province, and has been made the subject of some correspondence with people who are interested in that question.

DISPROVED BY ANALYSIS.

Now, if the hon. member will take pains to analyze the facts as he knows them, to investigate the different constituencies called upon to vote not only with regard to members of this House, but with regard to local option by-laws, if he will take the trouble to follow up and analyze the figures in connection with these various contests, I am sure he would reach a conclusion directly opposite to his statement that the Conservative party of this Province and the liquor interests are in any way allied.

DISPROVED BY EAST MIDDLESEX.

Let us analyze the facts in one constituency alone, and if you wish to verify the conclusions indicated there you need

only take the other contests and you find the same results. I take the constituency of East Middlesex because the Liberal candidate in that contest was a man who was distinctly a temperance man in his life, in his profession, and in every other way. So far as I know, no one ever suggested the contrary. Now let us see what happened in that constituency. Take the Township of London, which only the January preceding had voted on local option and came within one or two votes of carrying it by sixty per cent., which meant that this township was a very strong local option township, but this township is as well about sixty per cent. Conservative. If there should be any doubt about this see the bye-election returns of a few months later when the hon. gentleman who represents East Middlesex in this House and on this side of it found that he had received practically the same percentage of the vote in London Township that had been cast for local option a few months before. I do not propose to draw unfair deductions from that. But I do say this: that every time the hon. member or anyone behind him stands upon the public platform and attempts to say to Conservative or Liberal that the Conservatives are allied with the liquor interests, he does a direct and lasting injury to the cause that the temperance people are advocating. I can establish it by actual facts; I can establish it by names I could repeat, but which I am not going to repeat here to-day. When the question of local option has been on in the past what has happened? Conservative and Liberal electors have gone arm-in-arm to the little red schoolhouse and have polled their votes according to their best judgment, and that without reference to politics, and they have come back without discussing partisan politics at all. But in the bye-election in East Middlesex it has been said to Conservative voters, "You must come behind our Liberal candidate or I won't go behind local option when it comes up in January next." That actually happened in East Middlesex in the first bye-election, and in more than one part of East Middlesex. I want to say that just the moment that kind of thing appears, it means that one of the most serious blows that could be struck is being dealt to the cause of temperance.

DISPROVED BY NORTH GREY.

We have had several elections in this Province since the last general elections. We have had, I believe, eleven in all. It is perhaps a tribute to the good sense of the people of this Province, and at the same time a hint to the hon. gentleman to stop and think, that out of eleven elections eleven Conservatives were returned to support this Government, and that those Conservatives have been returned regardless of whether these townships, towns and villages, were "wet" or "dry" municipalities, and regardless of whether these constituencies went Liberal or Conservative in the general elections of 1911.

Take North Grey. Can anyone say that in this constituency it was a case of the Conservatives and the liquor interests as "allies" going to the polls? Just let me point out that in this bye-election the Liberal majority of 750 in 1911 was converted into a Conservative majority of four hundred and some odd. That means that the people who gave the Liberal majority in 1911 voted for the Conservative candidate in the last bye-election. Does anyone mean to say that the liquor interest has anything to do with this, and that so large a section of the Liberal vote as was necessary to make the change swung over to the liquor "allies"? The proposition is unfair to the electors of North Grey.

I move the adjournment of the Debate.

CONTINUATION.

MR. SPEAKER: Before moving the adjournment of the Debate I took occasion to refer to the amendment of 1912 and to the anxiety that appeared to occupy the minds of our friends opposite in 1913. I did indicate that the first-born amendment of the Leader of the Opposition made in this House in 1912 died before it reached the cradle, and that the anxiety of 1913 was not strong enough to last through the bye-elections that have taken place since.

THE AMENDMENT OF 1914.

Now we come to this amendment—the amendment of 1914. I do not know exactly what estimate experts make as to the

longevity of this amendment. As nearly as we can find out, it will scarcely reach the nurse, much less the cradle. The amendment is certainly a great tribute to this Government in more ways than one. It is likewise a great tribute to the inventive genius of the hon. gentleman who to-day leads the Opposition in this Province. I doubt if anyone outside of the hon. gentleman himself could possibly have devised this amendment. I say that the amendment is a tribute to this Government. A tribute because after upwards of nine years in administering the affairs of this Province, and after bringing down the Speech from the Throne the other day containing so much (as it did) in the way of work done, work being done and work contemplated for consideration this Session, the hon. gentleman cannot commence an amendment with even a word of regret as to anything that has been done, but has to go out into new fields that no one ever ventured in before, and that no one will ever follow him into and that he will never venture into again.

DO WE NEED A "MINISTER OF UNEMPLOYMENT"?

Mr. Speaker, we have had again and again suggestions as to the advisability of adding additional Ministers with portfolio to the Cabinet. For instance, we have had suggestions, and with fair reasons in their support, it may be, that we should have in this Province a Minister of Health. A Minister of Health would find in this Province good work to do; he would find work that might well employ all the time of the best man who could be put in charge of such important work. We have had as well a suggestion that we should have a Minister of Municipal Institutions. The proposition of a Minister of Municipal Institutions would have a great deal of reason to support it. A Minister of Municipal Institutions would probably find in this Province work that would employ him from one end of the year to the other. But never until now has anyone had the courage or the genius to suggest a "Minister of Unemployment" for this Province. I say then that it is a tribute to the Government that he had to go so far afield to find material for an amendment, and a tribute to the inventive genius of the Leader of the Opposition that when others would have approved of the Address in reply he evolved an amendment.

AN EXTRAORDINARY AMENDMENT.

Now while the amendment is in itself extraordinary, unusual, and, I think, we can all admit most unexpected, it may perhaps be explained by the speech that was made in its support.

BASED ON WRONG IMPRESSIONS.

The hon. member in supporting his amendment worked along two particular lines that were entirely his own, and in both of which he was wrong. He did not say so, but he did what he can do so well, he gave an "impression" that leads altogether further than any words to which he would venture to commit himself. The two particular premises on which he bases his amendment are what? First, "labour conditions, the suffering from unemployment and all the attendant surroundings in this Province are worse than elsewhere."

MR. ROWELL: I did not say so.

MR. HANNA: While the hon. member did not say so in actual words, the "impression" that anyone listening to the speech must have carried away was that owing to the lack of proper measures on the part of the Government we have a most lamentable condition in the Province, and particularly in the City of Toronto.

The second point was—and this he did literally state—that we in the Province are behind in the matter of social legislation.

CONDITIONS BETTER IN ONTARIO THAN ELSEWHERE.

These are the two propositions on which the amendment now before the House was based. I say that both propositions are wrong. I am not overstating it when I say that here in this Province, and in the Dominion of Canada as a whole, we have suffered less during the past twelve months from unemployment and the conditions brought about by over-production and by the different things that can be accounted for and are well understood, than they have in other parts of this continent. No-

where has the suffering been less on this continent of America than it has been in this Province. Conditions generally throughout this Province have been good in comparison with conditions that prevail elsewhere.

But the hon. gentleman gave some figures as to conditions that prevail in the City of Toronto. He told us how, in company with a social reform worker, he had called upon some ten families to investigate conditions, and he told us in vivid language of the conditions he found in some eight of those visited. I could well understand that the conditions he found were as he states them to be. At the same time, in comparison with other cities, other states and other countries, we in this Province occupy a position of which we have every reason to be proud.

THE SITUATION EXAGGERATED.

The hon. gentleman told us that there were from 11,000 to 13,000 men at present out of employment in the City of Toronto, and he went on to say that in Toronto that meant, with dependents considered, between 45,000 and 50,000 people suffering to-day from unemployment. I just want to say that these figures are larger than any that can fairly be supported, larger than those given to us by the representatives of labor within the last few weeks. The figures given the other day by the representatives of labor in this city were that there were probably 6,000 out of employment, and this figure was based on the fact that 3,000 were registered as being out of work and ready for work if it were offered, and that another 3,000 were estimated to be unregistered, producing the total of 6,000 ready for work if it presented. All I can say is that these figures are just as likely to be correct as the figures given to this House by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

ONTARIO CONDITIONS COMPARE FAVOURABLY.

But taking the figures submitted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, how does Toronto compare with other cities across the line? Personally, I know nothing about it, but I think we can fairly take the newspapers of the City of Detroit as indicating the measure of unemployment existing in that city to-day. What is the estimate of the newspapers? I might

just say in passing that they do not take an estimate of 11,000 or 13,000 and work it up by multiplying four or five times to a total of 45,000 or 50,000. The estimate of unemployed in that city to-day, and bear in mind that the City of Detroit has a population that can fairly be compared with that in the City of Toronto, figures from 80,000 to 100,000. In discussing this subject, it seems to me that instead of obtaining figures and applying them to the City of Toronto and then multiplying them by four or five so as to get his 45,000 or 50,000 and giving this out to the newspapers of the Province, the Leader of the Opposition might better have said that the Government of this Province can be congratulated because the City of Toronto compares so admirably and so favourably with the City of Detroit in this whole question of unemployment.

Take the City of New York. Here the figures are 350,000 out of employment in the City of New York. I am not for a moment comparing the City of Toronto on an even basis with the City of New York, but when you take the percentages and work them out in proportion you arrive at a fair basis of comparison. And if you take the figures of the hon. gentleman and work out the proportion there, I want to say that he has not made out a very strong case for a "Minister of Employment." I say that he is wrong then in stating that Ontario conditions are very bad. True, he fortified that by saying in a whisper and in a word that we are not so bad by comparison, but when he says that in a word he says the other in sentences, paragraphs and pages, and it is the sentences and the paragraphs and the pages that are impressed on the minds of those who regard him as their Leader.

IS ONTARIO BEHIND IN SOCIAL LEGISLATION?

Then he went on to say that "Ontario is behind in social legislation." "Ontario behind in social legislation?" Is there anything in that? Surely that is a most extraordinary statement. I was a bit surprised at that statement. "Ontario behind in social legislation?" I should have thought this statement impossible but that I heard the hon. gentleman himself make it, and having heard him make it I have come to the conclusion that he is probably the only public man who would

make it—a splendid tribute to his courage, but, I am afraid, not so much to his discretion or his reputation.

Has the hon. gentleman followed social legislation in this Province?

PUBLIC HEALTH MEASURES.

What does social legislation include? While we may not have gone into the scientific definition of the words, we have an idea in this Government that social legislation has something to do with, among other things, public health. Is this properly social legislation? Do not such things affect the life of the people; are they not matters that would come properly within the term? What then have we done about matters of public health? I am not going to attempt to enumerate all that is covered by the Public Health Act in this Province, but I am going to refer to some things taken care of in that Act, and to the estimate put on that Act by people who are not in politics in this Province, but who are known the world over.

TRIBUTE FROM THE LONDON "LANCET."

Amongst many tributes I need only refer to the fact that the *London Lancet*—perhaps the highest authority in the world in matters relative to medical science, an authority that, perhaps, no medical man in Ontario would care to question—has given our Act unstinted space in their columns and have reviewed it with approval.

DISTRICT HEALTH OFFICERS.

Let me just say here a word as to our system of specially trained District Officers, one of whom has supervision over several counties. The work these District Officers are doing is particularly appreciated by the people of this Province. I speak for the officer in my district, covering as he does five to six rich counties, five or six counties fairly abreast of the times in all that relates to the home and the farm and the shop. I want to say that there is not a man in those five or six counties more appreciated by the people than that District

Health Officer. There is not a man in those five or six counties who can more readily get a hearing than this officer. This will be more clear when I tell you that the officer in this district can call a meeting of a Saturday afternoon and find that four or five hundred people are present and that four or five rural schools are fairly represented in that meeting, and that same officer can hold another meeting in that same town that same night and have that same place filled again, or he can go into twenty-five different schools, if you please, in a county and go into the question of examining the pupils, he can send word that he wants the parents there, but whether he does or not, the parents are there, the pupils are there, and to-day as a result of the system provided in our Act we are approaching a condition of medical health in the urban and rural schools of this Province that is second to none that we know of.

WATER SUPPLY AND SEWAGE DISPOSAL.

In this same Health Act we took over the question of water supply and sewage disposal in the Province, with a consequent check of typhoid epidemics—it may have appeared high-handed, and I have no hesitation in saying that many municipalities thought it was high-handed—we took over the protection of men employed in railway, lumber and mining construction camps. There was a provision for this before, it is true, but no man who was in touch with happenings in these camps prior to the legislation of a few years ago,—after we came into power in the Province,—will say that those regulations were at all adequate for the situation.

COMPLETE CONTROL OF EPIDEMICS.

Then what more? Our Act vested in the Government the complete control of smallpox epidemics. Let me give you an illustration. At Niagara Falls, Ontario, last year we had an outbreak of smallpox. Within three weeks of the time of notification to us Niagara Falls on the Ontario side was completely in hand. What is the condition to-day on the New York side? Right across the river they have had smallpox for upwards of two months, and Niagara, New York, to-day is

worse than it has been at any time. There has been no check, because the laws do not reach it. We reached it in three weeks on this side of the line. And yet the hon. member says that we are behind in social legislation in Ontario!

FREE SUPPLY OF VACCINE AND SERUM.

I am not going to enumerate all the provisions of our Act, but they include free supply of vaccine to the public for the prevention of typhoid fever, arrangements for supplying diphtheria anti-toxin to the public at cost, serums for various diseases, such as rabies, etc., etc. We are providing them ourselves, in order that everyone who wants them can have them at the cost of producing them and that there should be no charge for services rendered. I only mention these in connection with the public health legislation, and the public health legislation is but a small part of the total health work we have been doing in this Province.

PROVINCIAL HEALTH EXHIBITS.

Apart from legislation, we have had health exhibits on the road. The great railways have put themselves at our service and have furnished transportation. We have put on exhibits in the different towns and different parts of this Province. Those exhibits have been appreciated both in the north country and in the older parts of the Province. They were appreciated when put on at the exhibition in the City of Toronto, as they have been in the last two years.

A TRIBUTE FROM FRANCE.

Let me give you a tribute to that health exhibit and to what we have done in dealing with tuberculosis in the Province of Ontario. It is only within the past few weeks that we received a request that is perhaps as high a tribute to what we have done in this Province as has ever passed from one country to another—a request from Lyons, France, where there is a Tuberculosis Convention, international and world-wide. It meets in Lyons, France, this year, and the Secretary writes to us to say that

our tuberculosis exhibit and the work we are doing and the educational work we are carrying on is, so far as they are able to ascertain, among the best in the world, and what does he ask? He asks that we send that exhibit to Lyons, France, and send a man to demonstrate there what we are doing with that dread disease, that white plague, tuberculosis, in this Province of Ontario. I want to say that a tribute like this means a great deal more than a statement from any man, I do not care who he is, that we are "behind the times" in the way of social legislation.

AN EXTENSIVE SYSTEM OF PAMPHLETS, ETC., ETC.

We are doing a lot of other work as well. There is an extensive system of pamphlets, bulletins and leaflets which we are distributing, regulations for taking care of everything so far as human care and common sense can do it. This is a matter of some interest which may have escaped the attention of the hon. gentleman. One of the things we have brought out is a pamphlet on "The Care of the Baby." I commend this to the careful perusal of the hon. gentleman in connection with this recent amendment. (Laughter.) Two of the sessional babies of the hon. gentleman are dead and gone, and all because of the unnatural conditions that surrounded them. Let me therefore commend to his perusal our pamphlet entitled "The Care of the Baby." Then we have a pamphlet on "Flies" and a pamphlet on "Mosquitoes," which I refer to the hon. gentleman for perusal before drawing further amendments.

HOUSING LEGISLATION.

"Ontario behind in social legislation?" Has the hon. member not only forgotten what we have done in the way of medical health in this Province, but also a dozen other things? We cannot name them all at once. We must name them one at a time, and number two happens to be our housing legislation in the Province.

What are we doing there? I think that subject has something to do with the social conditions of the people; the hon. member thinks so himself, as indicated in a speech which he

made in the City of Hamilton in October last. Let me say that if the report of that speech had not appeared in a Liberal newspaper I could not have believed it. Had it come out only in a Conservative newspaper as the report of the hon. gentleman's speech I should have said "That cannot be a true report of the hon. gentleman. He has not prepared the report himself, and therefore it cannot be true." But we read it in the *Guelph Mercury*, a despatch from Hamilton, and the whole of his speech dealt with this question of housing. The crying need of this Province of Ontario, according to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in that speech, is something that will enable the people to go ahead and build proper housing accommodation, something like what they have in England, and the newspaper report goes on to say that the hon. gentleman on that occasion "traced legislation in England with regard to housing since 1851." I do not know anything which, in my judgment, could be half as interesting as hearing the hon. gentleman "trace housing legislation in England since 1851." Think of it!—forty-nine years before the opening of this century and thirteen years on top of that, making a total of sixty-two years, and the hon. gentleman did all this in one night when he spoke in Hamilton in October last! And what did the hon. gentleman say? Amongst other things, he said that in this Province of Ontario we are "ten years behind every other country in the world with regard to housing conditions, excepting the United States of America."

ONTARIO ACT SECOND TO NONE.

Now I thought that a most extraordinary statement, because looking back and remembering the opinion of some people who pretend to know, who are putting time and money into the work, I had a faint suspicion that in this Province we, so far as housing legislation is concerned, are in advance of the world to-day. When I read of the hon. gentleman as reported in his Hamilton speech quoting the legislation of the Hon. John Burns, and when I read in another article a little later on that the Hon. John Burns may be a guest of this Province of Ontario the coming summer, and read, too, that one of the things he will investigate in this Province of Ontario

will be the housing legislation passed here a year ago, I began to think that my suspicions were right. With this extraordinary report of the hon. gentleman's speech, and with "the whole history of housing legislation in England traced from 1851" we still dared to doubt, and we wrote someone who had given special attention to this subject and asked him for an opinion, and here is his statement—a statement which was not a great surprise to me. He says:—

"The most progressive housing legislation in Europe is the John Burns' Housing and Town Planning Act of England that was passed in 1909, and the intricacies of operation under it are such that only one or two towns have as yet carried a scheme to completion. Compared with it the Ontario Act is simplicity itself, and fits into the genius of our municipal legislation and our methods of municipal administration in a way that makes it as a beginning at any rate almost ideal."

And that means, sir, that our social legislation of last session compares favourably with what is admittedly the best social legislation in Europe—the bill of the Hon. John Burns passed in 1909. Now I do not wish to follow in too great detail the speech of my hon. friend with regard to our housing legislation, but there are two or three things that will perhaps stand repetition, first because they are true, and secondly because we like to read them ourselves and perhaps some hon. gentleman in this House may like to listen, and I am still quoting from the same very high authority:—

"The result is that no legislation could be better adapted to meet the present situation in Ontario than that recently passed by the Legislature."

"Most important of all, however, is the demonstration here made possible of what people may do to help themselves when the Government by wise legislation provides assistance without dispensing charity, and guidance without destroying personal initiative and public co-operation. This indeed is legislation of a high order, framed upon principles which develop public spirit and inspire public service."

Now with regard to that legislation. I may say that the different writers on the subject, men who are to-day the authorities on this continent and elsewhere, point to our legislation as the best on any statute book the world over. What does the report say? (Reads):—

“In fact the actual carrying out of what is now made possible by Ontario's housing and transportation legislation would be of world-wide interest, and ‘The Ontario Plan’ would be referred to wherever a serious study of these problems was undertaken.”

I would advise the hon. member before addressing the Board of Trade at Hamilton or elsewhere to make a “serious study” of this housing problem, and when next time he gets up to make a speech on the subject, instead of referring to the legislation of Europe, he will tell that the last word, so far as he has been able to ascertain, is the legislation passed by a Toronto Government in the Province of Ontario in the year 1913.

There are some things that we have done that perhaps have something to do with the social conditions of the people.

IMPROVED CONDITIONS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

Need I refer to what we have been trying to do in this Province during the past eight or nine years in the way of improving conditions in the public institutions of this Province? I do not wish to go into detail here, but I am going to quote his authority—the President, the man who is at the head of the State Institution in Pennsylvania, the man who was at the Convention at Niagara last year and visited some of the public institutions of this Province and saw not only our existing institutions, but saw the new organization in course of construction at Whitby, to which we expect to transfer the institutions at Toronto. He not only said that the site of this institution was ideal in every particular, but he said more—that our plan and our organization from start to finish was probably the best the world over.

A MISLEADING STATEMENT CORRECTED.

I take opportunity here to answer a question that has come through the newspapers—in error no doubt—with regard to milk supplies. I am sure the House will pardon me if I take a moment or two to do what may be regarded as unnecessary. I have heard it again and again stated that we in the public institutions are not paying sufficient regard to avoiding the feeding of tubercular milk to the patients in those institutions. Now, in order that I may be correct in this, I have carefully looked just what we have done, and this is the situation:

PRECAUTIONS AS TO MILK SUPPLY.

We have had every animal producing milk subjected to the tuberculin test by a competent veterinary surgeon. We have segregated all the animals showing tubercular taint; the valuable animals that it was thought wise to preserve we have segregated in stables entirely separated from the healthy herds; where the infected herd are kept a most complete system of pasteurization has been installed. Absolutely every tubercular germ is destroyed. All of the milk at the other institutions comes from the healthy herds, have been certified to be free from tubercular infection. The milk is milked in the most cleanly fashion and at once placed in cold storage where it is held for use. The stables have been thoroughly disinfected. We have absolute confidence in what we are doing in so far as scientific management is concerned. We have changed the milk supply from a possible source of contamination, a means by which many diseases may have been introduced, to what is probably the most sanitary milk fed to any 10,000 people on the continent. I want to say that there is not a cow comes into the herd until that cow has been subjected to the tuberculin test, and this test is repeated year after year; that not a cow that reacts goes into the regular herd, but is segregated and the milk from that segregated herd is thoroughly pasteurized.

PRISON REFORM.

Then perhaps I may be excused if I refer to what we are doing in the way of prison reform in this Province. The hon.

gentleman, I think, in moving the amendment seemed to be under the impression that there is in fact some relationship between social legislation and prison reform. He did say some very complimentary things; he did not dwell long on them. This is a matter of some regret, because, really, if he would put half the industry and one-quarter the brains into matters of this kind that he does into shaping amendments such as the one now submitted, I want to say that there would be a speech that we would all be delighted to listen to.

What is our position with regard to prison reform? I do not desire to go into the matter in detail, but shall just deal with the matter in a word. There are two or three tributes that have reached us as to what this Province is doing with regard to prison reform that I may be excused for repeating.

PRAISE FROM U. S. PRESIDENT.

One of these tributes comes from a deputation appointed by the new President of the United States of America, and it is the highest kind of a tribute. Let me explain that a deputation of four from the State of which he was then Governor visited Guelph and spent one day there investigating carefully the various features of the institution. They went back and reported as to what they had seen. In perhaps two months another deputation of seven came and spent another day investigating with equal care, and at the end of that day the second deputation said: "Perhaps you will think it curious that a second deputation should come from the same quarter within two months?" We said, "No"—that we were always glad to welcome deputations from any quarter who desired to investigate what we are doing in this Province. However, the deputation went on to say that the reason for the second deputation of seven was that the report of the first deputation of four had been so incredible that the second deputation was sent along to find "what kind of dope we had fed to that first deputation" to enable them to come back and present such an extraordinary report. They went on to say: "We are going back to report the same way, but we are afraid that our report will not advance matters much, because our report will be just as strange and just as incredible as the first." Now I thought that a very high tribute, and it was one that we appreciated very much.

ENDORSED BY THE GERMAN IMPERIAL COMMISSION

There was another high tribute paid by the Commission sent by Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany to visit the Guelph institution and report—a deputation of very high-class men. I won't undertake to pronounce the names of the gentlemen composing this Commission, but shall leave that for the hon. member for North Waterloo or South Waterloo. These men came to this institution after having visited some of the leading institutions of the United States, they came fortified with the best information on the subject the world over. What did they say? They were careful at the outset to say that their report, so far as detail was concerned, must first be made to their own Government. They did not talk as freely perhaps as we on this side of the water sometimes do, but this they said:—

“There were many things with which we were strikingly impressed, and which will receive our attention when the time comes for making our report at home. The cells are splendidly located, the ample light admitted by their exposure being a fine humanitarian feature.”

And, just think, the hon. Leader of the Opposition says we are “behind the times in social legislation”! They then go on to say:—

“The doors leading to the cells particularly attracted our attention. They are a vast improvement over those which we have in Germany. The cell windows, too, appealed to us. They can be opened at will, and give good ventilation, instead of having the air percolate stingily through the ceiling. We feel deeply indebted to the British Government for the suggestion that we should come to Canada.”

To this the Consul-General for Germany added:—

“The visit to Canada meant considerable alteration in the original plans of the Commission, but any inconvenience has been more than compensated for by the profitable nature of the visit to Guelph.”

That is a tribute from perhaps the most important deputation that ever visited this country on matters of this kind. They did not end there. They stated that they had investigated particularly the organization of that institution, and they paid us the compliment of saying that from the head of the department down to and including the prisoners in the institution they found an organization that they thought unexcelled anywhere so far as they had been able to ascertain. Let me add that the door and ventilation system they referred to are absolutely original so far as prison construction anywhere the world over is concerned. It is used for the first time at the Prison Farm at Guelph.

THE HYDRO-ELECTRIC.

"No social legislation!" What better social legislation can you possibly find in this Province or elsewhere than what the Government is doing in connection with the Hydro-Electric in this Province—the Hydro-Electric that touches the home at every point, that touches the farm at every point, that means heat, that means light, that means the power that we must have at home, in the shops, in the factories, and that at the minimum of cost? The hon. member will have some difficulty in finding a country that has surpassed us in this respect.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

"Social legislation!" Take the Workmen's Compensation Act. Where is there any country or any state in advance of what is proposed in connection with the Workmen's Compensation Act in this Province? I simply mention this in answering the hon. gentleman's statement that we are "behind in social legislation," for it is evident that he has surely overlooked much, if not all, of the social legislation placed on the statute books of this Province.

EDUCATION.

We have many other matters of importance to the people of the Province of Ontario which I do not propose to deal with in detail to-day. But let me say a word with regard to educa-

tional matters in the Province. What are the conditions in the Province to-day in comparison with what we found when we came into power in 1905? We found a starved state university, disheartened teachers, meagre grants to schools, and an utter lack of vigour in the whole system. The easiest course for the Government to follow was to do as little as possible, to arouse no hostility, to excite no criticism, but to go on administering the old system until it became moribund from sheer exhaustion. Instead of dodging the serious situation bequeathed to it by its predecessors, the Government grappled with each problem in turn. The state university has been made the pride of the Province, and its numerous graduates and students are proof that Ontario does not lag behind in enlightenment and mental equipment. The school grants have been more than doubled. The rural schools are passing into the hands of Normal-trained teachers, with higher salaries and better prospects. A good start has been made in industrial and agricultural training, from which great results may confidently be expected. We have given the school children the best text-books at the lowest price ever known in our history, and all over this continent the example of Ontario is cited as a triumph in text-book policy. The administration of education, as everyone knows, bristles with difficulty, but this fact has not deterred us from taking advanced ground, so that our educational system may challenge comparison with the best.

AGRICULTURE.

Then as to agriculture. I do not know exactly what the hon. member said with regard to agriculture, but I expect it was something in line with what the hon. gentleman generally says on that subject—that the Department of Agriculture is not going fast enough, is not making enough noise, if you please, to suit the Leader of the Opposition and those behind him in the House. I want to say this—and I say it because I at one time knew a little about the subject of agriculture: I do not think that agriculture has ever received greater encouragement or that the farmers have ever received greater help than they have under this Government, and particularly than they are receiving to-day under the present Minister of Agriculture.

ONTARIO AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

What are the tests by which we are going to come to a conclusion as to whether the Department of Agriculture is doing its duty in the Province of Ontario to-day? Are you going to the Agricultural College at Guelph to make your tests there? Let me say that if you go there you will find two young men there to every one that was there when we came into power upwards of nine years ago, when, as hon. gentlemen opposite claim, there were more boys on the farm to draw from than at present. Will you make your test as to what is being done? You will find a better equipped college, you will find a better curriculum, you will find accommodation for the man who can take a four weeks' course, a six weeks' course, a two years' course, a four years' course; each can go to that institution and find not only employment for all the time he can give, but will find the teachers there to give him the best results for the time he can devote to the particular part of the institutional work that his means and his time allow.

RURAL DEMONSTRATORS.

But this is not all. When was there a time in this Province when there were thirty-seven District Representatives, experts, demonstrators—call them what you please—well-manned, well-equipped, familiar with local conditions, rendering not intermittent, but day-to-day service to local people, carrying scientific knowledge of the best farming methods to the home of the farmer's son, to the women's institutions, to the different organizations throughout this Province that are interested in the great work of agriculture that must in the end be the mainstay and the backbone of this great Province—a system unparalleled in any state or Province on this continent—a system envied by all and copied by many. Take the work of these men, their leadership in all the organized activities of the rural communities, their contact with thousands of boys and girls through the rural school fairs, their instructive and inspiring association with hundreds of boys in the four and six weeks' courses. Take, if you will, the Women's Institutes, increasing in number, keen and energetic in action, lofty in ideals for

anything that betters the home and builds up the community. Take the keen competitions in grain and roots and live stock at all our fairs and exhibitions. Take all these things, and what do they mean? They mean an efficient and effective Department, but they mean more. I believe that never before were there as many earnest, progressive farmers in the Province of Ontario as at the present time.

NO CAUSE FOR PESSIMISM.

Let the hon. gentlemen opposite be as pessimistic as they like, let them "write their library of lamentations" if they choose. They may look sad in appearance and small in number, but we on this side are not going to follow them in that direction—not for a moment. We see no decadent countryside. We see changes and readjustments, but out of all we can see emerging an agriculture based on permanence and achieving the highest ambitions of quality. We see in the vigorous and virile young manhood of rural Ontario, eagerly seeking information at every turn, a guarantee that the future of the agriculture of this Province will surpass even the splendid records of past years. We look forward to a Province of even greater things—a Province with boys and girls in the rural districts fully equipped for the battle of life. We travel on a better road, and leave the hon. gentlemen to travel their particular road alone.